

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL
REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL LAMONTE EVANS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B276642

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. 6PH03915)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Jacquie H. Lewis, Judge. Affirmed.

Michael Lamonte Evans, in pro. per.; and Heather E. Shallenberger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A petition for revocation of parole filed May 31, 2016 alleged that Michael Lamonte Evans (Evans) had violated the terms and conditions of his supervision. Evans had been released from Wasco State Prison on April 25, 2016. His parole conditions required him to report to the Alameda Parole Office before 10:00 a.m. on the next day, April 26, but Evans failed to report. He also failed to participate in continuous electronic monitoring, or to register as a registrant under Penal Code section 290, as the conditions of his parole required. The petition recommended revocation of Evans's parole and a return to custody for 180 days.

At a hearing on June 6, 2016, Evans testified that on the morning of his release on April 25, the police dropped him off at the Bakersfield Greyhound station. His bus was hours late and then kept breaking down all the way to Los Angeles, arriving four to five hours late. Evans was frustrated; he had plans, and he was hours late. That was the only reason why he did not report. The trial court commented that Evans waited a month to report, and found the allegations in the report to be true. The court revoked and then restored parole on the same terms and conditions, modified to require Evans to serve 180 days in county jail, with custody credits of 32 days. Evans filed a timely appeal on June 10, 2016 from the June 6, 2016 order.

We appointed counsel to represent Evans on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to review the record independently. After we advised Evans he had 30 days to

submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider, he submitted a supplemental letter brief. Evans argues that the 180 days he served for his parole violation should have been credited to him, with reference to a later arrest on August 26, 2016, more than two months after Evans filed his notice of appeal in this case. “ ‘Our jurisdiction on appeal is limited in scope to the notice of appeal and the judgment or order appealed from.’ ” (*Soldate v. Fidelity National Financial, Inc.* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1069, 1073.) We have no jurisdiction over claims based on events occurring after the filing of the notice of appeal.

We have examined the entire record and we are satisfied that Evans’s counsel on appeal has fully complied with her responsibilities, and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

CHANEY, Acting P. J.

LUI, J.